

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Traci Armstrong, and Your Muse Traci, LLC,
Plaintiffs,

v.

Anna Elizabeth, and Magic & Miracles,
Defendants.

Civil Action No.:

COMPLAINT

[DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL]

Plaintiffs Traci Armstrong (“Armstrong”) and Your Muse Traci, LLC (“YMT”) (collectively “Plaintiffs”) by and through their attorneys Gilbert Law PLLC, for and by their Complaint, allege against Defendants Anna Elizabeth (“Elizabeth”) and Magic & Miracles (“M&M”) (collectively “Defendants”):

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This matter stems from a dispute between Plaintiffs and Defendants over whether Defendants can wield an expansive and unsupported theory of copyright law against Plaintiffs to prevent Plaintiffs’ regular, lawful competition. Defendants claim that simple ideas and concepts contained within their YouTube videos are themselves protected by the copyrights on the videos themselves and therefore support the issuance of takedown notices pursuant to the Digital Millenium Copyright Act of 1998 (17 U.S.C. § 512(c)) (the “DMCA”) against other videos allegedly containing similar ideas and concepts.

///

2. However, copyright does not and has never provided protection for ephemeral concepts and ideas. It is limited to works “fixed in any tangible medium of expression”¹ and not mere ideas or concepts². Given the plain meaning of decades of copyright law, Plaintiffs seek a declaration that Defendants’ copyrights do not protect Defendants’ generalized ideas or themes contained within Defendants’ audiovisual works or provide a basis for Defendants to file takedown notices against Plaintiffs’ posted works.

3. Further, Plaintiffs seek recovery from Defendants for their misuse of takedown provisions pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(f), as their wrongful use of takedown notices directly impacted Plaintiffs’ revenues for months on end. Even after being warned that their use of the DMCA’s takedown provisions were wrongful and based on a misunderstanding of copyright, Defendants persisted, filing a further baseless takedown request against Plaintiffs’ work.

4. Plaintiff wants only to operate her business in peace, providing guidance to people without worry that her work is going to be removed from the platforms on which she relies for revenue, and accordingly petitions this Court for relief.

PARTIES

5. Armstrong is an individual residing in Portland, Oregon.

6. YMT is a Wyoming Limited Liability Company with a business address of 7422 N. Williams Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97217.

7. Elizabeth is an individual residing, on information and belief, in New York City, New York.

¹ 17 U.S.C. § 102(a).

² 17 U.S.C. § 102(b).

8. M&M is, on information and belief, a sole proprietorship fully owned and operated by Elizabeth, with a principal place of business in New York City, NY.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This Court has original jurisdiction of this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 28 U.S.C. § 2201, and 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

10. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction of counts III and IV in this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

11. Venue is proper in this judicial district because, on information and belief, Defendants reside in this judicial district and conduct substantially all of their business from this judicial district.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

12. Ms. Armstrong has been a manifestation coach since 2017. She provides guidance and support for people seeking to change their life and improve themselves through honing their self-belief and metacognitive practices. Her primary responsibility as a manifestation coach was to provide guidance and wisdom to those seeking new modalities for understanding themselves and growing into better versions of themselves.

13. In her early years working as a manifestation coach, Armstrong developed methods, concepts, practices, and instruction styles which she used to guide clients towards self-improvement. These included assisting clients in becoming aware of their thoughts throughout the day, raising their consciousness and awareness, constructing a mental diet that is in line with what they want to experience, clearing out old beliefs and patterns and integrating the law of assumption belief system into their everyday lives.

14. From 2020 to 2023 Armstrong worked as a manifestation coach under the banner of Amanda Molyneux, who operated a company called Create Your Future, Inc. (<https://createyourfuture.co/>), as she developed her skills and learned how to instruct clients towards their goals. While working for Ms. Molyneux, Armstrong taught her clients how to apply techniques for manifesting, work on self-development and improvements, and coached them on their manifesting journey and personal development skills. Armstrong also grew in confidence as a coach, learning how to use video platforms like YouTube to share lessons.

15. Armstrong's coaching has generally taken place primarily online, where she could attract a wide clientele. She conducted live coaching on video platforms like Google Meet and posted videos explaining key concepts on video sharing platforms like YouTube³.

16. After several years working for Create Your Future, Inc., in an effort to expand her business and increase her earnings, Armstrong sought out coaches who specialized in teaching other coaches to improve their practices. In early 2024, Armstrong discovered Elizabeth through Elizabeth's public YouTube channel, and paid her \$2,750 for her "coaching for coaches" packages.

17. Shortly after beginning her coaching sessions and learning about Armstrong's background and experiences, Elizabeth started encouraging Armstrong to leave her employer (Create Your Future, Inc.; hereinafter, "CYF") and start her own venture providing manifestation coaching to clients directly. Elizabeth told Armstrong that she was being taken advantage of by CYF, and that she should go out on her own and build her own channel. As part of the coaching, Elizabeth reviewed Armstrong's existing videos from her time at CYF and was fully aware that Armstrong had been coaching people in their manifestation journey – using extremely similar language and concepts as comprised Elizabeth's coaching practice.

³ YouTube is a video hosting website owned and operated by Google LLC.

18. Armstrong was empowered by this advice, and followed it, launching her YouTube channel and beginning to post videos on February 9, 2024 under the banner name <https://www.youtube.com/@YourMuseTraci>.⁴ Armstrong went on to form YMT on or about February 17, 2024.

19. Plaintiffs' business was a quick success, racking up numerous subscribers within weeks of launching. Within weeks of launching, she already had two thousand subscribers to her YouTube channel and had seven signed clients and a five-person waiting list for her services.

20. However, as Armstrong began posting more videos to YouTube and her company grew, Elizabeth grew cold to Armstrong. At the end of their second month of coaching, Armstrong sought to purchase another five-session package from Elizabeth. Elizabeth encouraged the \$850 purchase on a March 18, 2024, call (and in fact pushed Armstrong to purchase a ten-session package instead). Nevertheless, on March 19, 2024, Elizabeth abruptly and unilaterally terminated their agreement.

21. Armstrong was confused and upset by this rapid change, but she was determined to continue along her path and provide guidance and support to her thousands of followers and her many paying clients. Elizabeth, however, could not let the matter drop and began exacting her revenge.

22. On or about May 2, 2024, Elizabeth filed a DMCA takedown against YouTube videos Armstrong had posted. Pursuant to YouTube's DMCA-compliant policies⁵, Armstrong's allegedly offending videos were taken down and ceased generating advertising revenue. Those videos include:

⁴ Her video can be found here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LhlUdKuNJ8A>.

⁵ YouTube provides guidance on using their takedown system, and the applicable considerations and information to provide here: <https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/2807622?hl=en>.

- “Your SP will change when you change! #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #manifestation” (<https://youtu.be/s9JWdVMq3Vo>),
- “Does Your SP Have Free Will?? #lawofassumption #manifestation #nevillegoddard #specificperson” (https://youtu.be/dx7uHmL4I_s),
- “Your SP is Your Canvas!! #manifestation #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #specificperson” (<https://youtu.be/q-ooYzEB0kY>),
- “Circumstances Never Matter!! #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #manifestation #specificperson” (https://youtu.be/xhK6dw_dIBk),
- “Everything is Waiting on You! #manifestation #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #lawofattraction” (<https://youtu.be/bcN4ZQ9B0q0>),
- “What Your SP or Anyone is Thinking! #lawofassumption #lawofattraction #manifest #nevillegoddard” (<https://youtu.be/m39SB2JpVw8>),
- “Your SP Wants Exactly What you Want #nevillegoddard #lawofassumption #manifest #specificperson” (<https://youtu.be/0ClSyauG1cw>), and
- “Is it Delusion or Creation? #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #lawofattraction #specificperson” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=utqtTqqbfEM>).

23. In addition to the YouTube DMCA takedowns, Elizabeth attempted to bring her claims to a tribunal – the Copyright Claims Board (“CCB”). On May 9, 2024, she filed two claims against Armstrong, asserting “Ms. Armstrong deliberately copied my own material word for words on her channel and is passing it off as her own work. Entire videos, full of my authentic, original

writing and recognizable signature way of talking and explaining things that are authentically my writing.” (Case nos. 24-CCB-0135 and 24-CCB-0136). However, the CCB ordered Elizabeth to amend her noncompliant claims twice before dismissing them both altogether on July 29, 2024.

24. Elizabeth filed a second case on May 16, 2024 asserting substantially similar claims (case no. 24-CCB-0148). The CCB again requested that Elizabeth amend her noncompliant claims twice before it dismissed Elizabeth’s claims without prejudice because Elizabeth’s audiovisual works lacked copyright registrations when the claims were filed and because she did not (and could not) allege that Armstrong’s works or parts thereof were substantially similar to protectible elements in Elizabeth’s works. In its June 26, 2024, correspondence to Elizabeth, the CCB went so far as to remind her:

“A valid copyright only extends to copyrightable subject matter, and copyright law only protects the components of a work that are original to the author. Copyright law does not protect concepts or ideas; it only protects original elements of expression. Copyright also does not protect individual words or common, short phrases, and the sporadic use of the same word or short phrase is not enough by itself to make two works substantially similar.”

Attached hereto as Exhibit A is the CCB’s June 26, 2024 correspondence to Elizabeth, ordering her to amend her claims lest they be dismissed without prejudice.

25. Finally, Elizabeth was apparently not satisfied with derailing Armstrong’s revenue through her wrongful DMCA takedowns and so Elizabeth began bad mouthing Armstrong across a number of platforms, including YouTube and social media websites such as Reddit.

26. Starting in May 2024, Defendants posted a series of YouTube videos specifically denigrating both Armstrong and YMT. Such videos include:

- “Your Muse Traci is a Copycat of Magic and Miracles#yourmusetraci#coach#copycat”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ks1wniTyHqA>),
- “Your Muse Traci is a Copycat of Magic & Miracles Part 2#yourmusetraci#copycat#coach”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rE5a0TelF8s>),
- “Your Muse Traci Persists and I Know How This Story Ends-Info Below  #yourmusetraci#coach”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DusylPRI-j8>),
- “Your Muse Traci Copying Magic and Miracles material 2 #yourmusetraci#copycat#coach”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2uIdP7Wllws>),
- Copycat Fraud and Q:What Prevents You From Jumping Realities?-InfoBelow  #yourmusetraci#copycat#coach
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p9XvBVkSAqU>), and
- “Q:Did You Manifest Traci the Copycat?-Info Below  #manifestationalcoach#yourmusetraci#coaching”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZZSL4zQLk3Y>).

27. At the same time, Elizabeth posted numerous times on social media websites about Plaintiffs, including but not limited to:

- <https://www.reddit.com/r/MagicandMiracles/comments/1d0qym6/your>

[muse_traci_is_a_fraud/?rdt=59532](#) (stating “She has engaged in incessant harassment on. y own YouTube channel under the guise of fake accounts, constantly posting nasty harassing comments and interfering with me answering viewers’s questions[,]” and “She’s just mentally not well and has nothing to offer but bad quality coaching at best. She is now in a lawsuit with Amanda from Create Your Future and had to remove that video from her channel where she claims she was the victim. And now she will be losing her YouTube channel and practice because she couldn’t stop stealing from me.”),

- [https://www.reddit.com/r/MagicandMiracles/comments/1chpey7/traci_armstrong_aka_yourmusetraci_admits_she_is_a/](#) (stating “She is a liar and a thief, mascarding as someone who is interested in helping people. She is not. This is a malignant narcissist only interested in her grandiosity and money.”),
- [https://www.reddit.com/r/LOACoachSnark/comments/1atgre0/comment/13l1bm4r/](#) (stating “The client list belonged to her employer. That’s how she got to coach them in the first place. It’s theft when you take what’s not yours.”), and
- [https://www.reddit.com/r/MagicandMiracles/comments/1cg2j37/the_magic_of_energy_and_thank_you_traciinfo/](#) (stating “Small update: YouTube just started taking down my copyright protected material Traci boldly copied on her channel. It’s unfortunate she didn’t cooperate after I asked her nicely twice. It’s unfortunate a coach like this exists and gives life coachs such a bad name.”).

28. None of these statements about Plaintiffs are accurate or were true when said. Further, as all of the comments about Plaintiffs come from Defendants' personal knowledge of the situation, they were published with knowledge of their falsity, and malicious intent. Since publication, Plaintiffs' reputation in the coaching community has suffered negative effects and individuals seeking coaching have seen and commented on the false statements.⁶

29. On June 28, 2024, Plaintiffs issued correspondence through counsel to Defendants explaining that Defendants' DMCA takedowns were unsupported by law as the copyrights on their audiovisual works did not cover the "generalized ideas or themes" which served as the basis for Defendants' takedown requests. Plaintiffs demanded that these takedown requests be retracted. A true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' correspondence is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

30. Despite receiving the June 26, 2024 letter related to her CCB claims and the June 28, 2024 letter from Plaintiffs and being on notice that her DMCA takedowns were premised on material misrepresentations, on June 29, 2024, Elizabeth filed a second takedown notice on YouTube, this time requesting that the following videos by Plaintiffs be taken down:

- "To Desire is to Have! #nevillegoddard #lawofassumption
#lawofassumptioncoach #manifestationcoach"
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qUpkxTBQnFI>),
- "Your SP is Your Canvas!! #manifestation #lawofassumption
#nevillegoddard #specificperson"
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-ooYzEB0kY>), and

⁶ For example, Defendants' posts on the following Reddit thread (<https://www.reddit.com/r/LOACoachSnark/comments/1atgre0/comment/12087dp/>) were interacted with by a series of other users of the website, each of whom was reading a forum dedicated to the very topics that Armstrong taught and sought clients for.

- “Is it Delusion or Creation? #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard
#lawofattraction #specificperson”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=utqtTqqbfEM>).

31. YouTube again complied with their obligations under relevant law and took down Plaintiffs’ videos.

32. Plaintiffs’ revenues decreased substantially as a result of Defendants’ wrongful takedown requests. Plaintiffs regularly earned between \$20,000 and \$40,000 per month from Armstrong’s YouTube videos in the few months since she launched her business. After Defendants’ wrongful takedown requests, Plaintiff was lucky to earn \$10,000 per month. Plaintiffs made no other changes to their business in that period which would account for the lowered revenue.

33. Elizabeth first responded to Armstrong’s June 28, 2024 correspondence through correspondence issued by counsel on July 8, 2024, asserting that Armstrong “used the copyrighted content numerous times in the past few months. These include the terms ‘costume and mask’ analogy described in the audiocast...She also repeatedly uses the term ‘buffet’ which is an analogy created by my client in her coaching. Again, this is another unique copyrighted term created by my client central to her teaching.”

34. Elizabeth also responded to Armstrong’s June 28, 2024 correspondence through correspondence issued by counsel on August 5, 2024, asserting “[t]he ‘life is a buffet’, ‘costume and mask,’ and ‘computer programming’ analogies are three examples of protectable elements of Ms. Elizabeth’s expression of ideas. They are not ‘generalized ideas or themes’ as you claimed in your letter. Rather, each are original works of authorship fixed in tangible mediums of expression and are copyright protected in accordance with 17 U.S.C.S. § 102(a).”

35. However, neither the July 8, 2024 correspondence nor the August 5, 2024 correspondence accurately reflect copyright law, which simply does not protect “ideas or concepts” and especially not words or short phrases.⁷

36. Plaintiffs are now forced to bring this action to finally stop Defendants’ unlawful interference with Plaintiffs’ business through 1) Defendants’ misuse of YouTube’s DMCA compliance system and misapplication of copyright law in general, and 2) Defendants’ cruel and untrue statements regarding Armstrong’s business and where Armstrong had learned and developed her teaching concepts. Defendants decided that they would stop at nothing to remove a strong competitor who only wanted to help people seeking to improve their lives.

COUNT I – DECLARATORY RELIEF (28 U.S.C. § 2201)

37. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

38. There presently exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants an actual and justiciable controversy with respect to Defendants’ assertions that the content contained within Defendants’ audiovisual works (including but not limited to such “generalized ideas or themes” as Elizabeth’s “life is a buffet,” “costume and mask,” and “computer programming” analogies) constitute protectable elements of Defendants’ works that are subject to protection under federal copyright law.

39. Plaintiffs presently have no adequate remedy at law short of a judicial declaration of Defendants’ rights with respect to the copyrights on their audiovisual recordings.

⁷ See 37 C.F.R. § 202.1(a); New York Mercantile Exchange, Inc. v. IntercontinentalExchange, Inc., 389 F. Supp. 2d 527, 543 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).

40. Although Plaintiffs have demanded that Defendants acknowledge that Defendants' copyrights do not protect the "generalized concepts and ideas" contained within Defendants' published audiovisual works, Defendants have refused to do so.

COUNT II – D.M.C.A. ABUSE (17 U.S.C. § 512(f))

41. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

42. On May 2, 2024, Elizabeth sent a takedown request through YouTube against the following Plaintiff-posted videos:

- "Your SP will change when you change! #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #manifestation" (<https://youtu.be/s9JWdVMq3Vo>),
- "Does Your SP Have Free Will?? #lawofassumption #manifestation #nevillegoddard #specificperson" (https://youtu.be/dx7uHmL4I_s),
- "Your SP is Your Canvas!! #manifestation #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #specificperson" (<https://youtu.be/q-ooYzEB0kY>),
- "Circumstances Never Matter!! #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #manifestation #specificperson" (https://youtu.be/xhK6dw_dIBk),
- "Everything is Waiting on You! #manifestation #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard #lawofattraction" (<https://youtu.be/bcN4ZQ9B0q0>),
- "What Your SP or Anyone is Thinking! #lawofassumption #lawofattraction #manifest #nevillegoddard" (<https://youtu.be/m39SB2JpVw8>),

///

- “Your SP Wants Exactly What you Want #nevillegoddard
#lawofassumption #manifestation #specificperson”
(<https://youtu.be/0ClSyauG1cw>), and
- “Is it Delusion or Creation? #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard
#lawofattraction #specificperson”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=utqtTqqbfEM>).

43. However, Defendants knew that their takedown request was wrongful. Elizabeth knew or should have known that the material representations she made in support of the takedown requests were misrepresentations, because she claimed that the copyrights on her audiovisual works protected unprotectable ideas and concepts.

44. On June 28, 2024, Plaintiffs issued correspondence through counsel to Defendants explaining that their DMCA takedowns were unsupported by law as the copyrights on Elizabeth’s audiovisual works did not cover the “generalized ideas or themes” and demanded that Defendants’ DMCA takedowns be retracted.

45. Nevertheless, on June 29, 2024, Elizabeth filed a further takedown request on YouTube, targeting the following Plaintiff-posted videos:

- “To Desire is to Have! #nevillegoddard #lawofassumption
#lawofassumptioncoach #manifestationcoach”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qUpkxTBQnfl>),
- “Your SP is Your Canvas!! #manifestation #lawofassumption
#nevillegoddard #specificperson”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-ooYzEB0kY>), and

///

- “Is it Delusion or Creation? #lawofassumption #nevillegoddard
#lawofattraction #specificperson”
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=utqtTqqbfEM>).

46. Similar to her first filed takedown, Elizabeth knew that material representations she made in support of the takedown requests were misrepresentations both because she claimed that the copyrights on her audiovisual works protected unprotectable ideas and concepts, and further because she had been informed by Plaintiffs and by attorneys at the CCB that her copyrights do not protect concepts or ideas. Nevertheless, Elizabeth filed her wrongful takedown requests with YouTube.

47. YouTube, to comply with its obligations under 17 U.S.C. § 512, took down and demonetized Plaintiffs’ videos after receiving Defendants’ requests. This caused Plaintiffs’ monthly revenue to sharply decrease, as they depended on revenue from advertising showing on Plaintiffs’ posted YouTube coaching videos.

48. However, as Defendants knew when they made each takedown request that they did not have a legal basis to make the requests, such requests constitute knowing material misrepresentations under 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

49. Plaintiffs were damaged by losing revenue that they were rightfully owed and would have earned, but for Defendants’ wrongful takedown requests based on material misrepresentations made to YouTube. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages, attorneys fees, and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

///

COUNT III – DEFAMATION

50. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

51. Beginning in May 2024, after Elizabeth terminated their coaching relationship, Elizabeth engaged in a concerted effort to disparage and demean Plaintiffs' professional and personal reputation through the rampant posting of false statements made on audiovisual posts hosted on YouTube, and in written posts on social media sites such as Reddit that Defendants knew were false when they made them.

52. Across these posts, and likely posts not yet identified, Elizabeth accuses Armstrong of, *inter alia*, harassing Elizabeth and preventing her from answering client questions, being a thief, being a liar, being mentally unwell, being a malignant narcissist, and others.

53. These posts appear designed to damage Armstrong's reputation in the manifestation coaching community (by asserting that she violated the trust of her former employer and stole materials and client lists) and among people searching for a life or manifestation coach.

54. As a result of these posts and baseless assertions, Plaintiffs have suffered significant economic loss to Armstrong's personal and professional reputation, each of which has been forever diminished among the community which she has served and been a part of for years. This misinformation has also spread to unknown people, preventing Plaintiffs from realizing revenue from clients who now will associate her with these assertions.

55. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover actual and compensatory damages. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of punitive and special damages in an amount to be determined by a jury.

///

COUNT IV – TRADE LIBEL

56. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

57. Beginning in May 2024, after Elizabeth terminated their coaching relationship, Elizabeth engaged in a concerted effort to disparage and demean Plaintiffs' professional and personal reputation through the rampant posting of false statements made on audiovisual posts hosted on YouTube, and in written posts on social media sites such as Reddit.

58. Across these posts, and likely posts not yet identified, Elizabeth accuses Armstrong of, *inter alia*, harassing Elizabeth and preventing her from answering client questions, being a thief, being a liar, being mentally unwell, being a malignant narcissist, and others.

59. These posts appear designed to damage Armstrong's reputation in the manifestation coaching community (by asserting that she violated the trust of her former employer and stole materials and client lists) and among people searching for a life or manifestation coach.

60. Most importantly, through these posts, Defendants assert that Armstrong is a bad coach, and provides bad services to clients. Plaintiffs have spent years developing their coaching skills, and now, just as their business is taking shape, these allegations could serve to unfairly disrupt their ability to grow their business, just as it was growing to compete with Defendants.

61. As a result of these posts and baseless assertions, Plaintiffs have suffered significant economic loss to Armstrong's professional reputation, which has been forever diminished among the community which she has served and been a part of for years.

62. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover actual and compensatory damages for these false statements about their services. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of punitive and special damages in an amount to be determined by a jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiffs hereby demand judgment in their favor and against Defendants Anna Elizabeth and Magic & Miracles as follows:

1. For an order declaring that the claimed terms, analogies, concepts, and specific phrases contained within Defendants' audiovisual work copyrights (including but not limited to any registered copyrights obtained on any of Defendants' audiovisual coaching videos posted on YouTube) do not constitute protectible elements for the purpose of either copyright infringement or to serve as the legal basis for a DMCA takedown claim;
2. For compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
3. For general, special, and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
4. An award of Plaintiffs' costs and reasonable attorney's fees, according to statute;
5. Such other relief this Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs Traci Armstrong and Your Muse Traci, LLC hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable of right.

Dated: September 13, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

GILBERT LAW PLLC

s/ Jake M. Gilbert

Jake M. Gilbert
jake@gilbertlaw.co
99 Wall Street, #1748
New York, NY 10005
(646) 580-6733
Attorney for Plaintiffs